

REMARKS

Status of Application

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the application. The RCE filed on October 28, 2009 has been entered. The prior rejections have been withdrawn, but new art has been cited.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oniishi (U.S. 5,859,845) in view of Lesesky (U.S. 2002/0060625, newly cited). For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner admits that Oniishi does not explicitly disclose that a data communication protocol has been converted. Office Action, p. 6. However, the Examiner relies on Lesesky as disclosing conversion of a first data communication protocol to a second data communication protocol.

Lesesky discloses in FIG. 4 that a first data communication protocol (such as SAE J1708, SAE J1939, or RS-485) is converted into a second data communication protocol (such as IrDa or other infrared or RF data communications protocol). *See* Lesesky, paragraphs [0031] - [0032]. The conversion is to allow for receipt of data at a remote data communications terminal, *See* Lesesky, FIG. 3, numeral 60.

However, Lesesky's second data communication protocol is a wireless or RF data communication "to transmit data through-the-air to a remote data communications terminal 60, 60'," which are not part of the vehicle's main or sub bus lines. Only the "*first* data communications protocol [is] associated with data communications along the plurality of electrical conductors," that are on the vehicle. Lesesky, Abstract (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Lesesky's data protocol conversion is not concerned with data protocol conversion between a main bus line and a sub bus line, both of which are *on the vehicle*.

To emphasize these differences, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

“wherein the front electrical control unit is configured to convert a communication protocol of the control signal from a high speed communication protocol of the main bus line on the vehicle into a low speed communication protocol of the sub bus line on the vehicle. . . .”

The data protocol conversion that takes place in Lesesky takes place outside of the main and sub bus lines. The protocol conversion shown in FIG. 4 appears to occur merely for the purpose of transmitting data “through-the-air” and not for conversion between a main bus line and a sub bus line. Even if the Examiner considers numerals 45, 40, and 38 to make up the main or sub bus lines, these elements appear to be embodied in the box labeled “Twisted Pair” and numbered 38 in FIG. 4. Accordingly, the data protocol conversion that does take place is not between a main bus line and a sub bus line.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. In that regard, Applicants have added new claim 12 which defines the high and low speed communication protocols to be CAN and LIN, respectively. Support for these amendments may be found at least in paragraphs [0095] - [0096] of the Pre-grant Publication No. U.S. 2006/0274467.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian W. Hannon/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Brian W. Hannon
Registration No. 32,778

Date: April 14, 2010